HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 18 Monday, May 5, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

LABOR: *Knowland outmaneuvers Democrats*.....(page 1)

IKE: *Behind Alcorn's utterance*.....(page 1)

HIGH COURT: *Conservative breakthrough*.....(page 3)

McCARTHY: *Wheeler pays tribute*.....(page 3)

FOUNDATIONS: *The inside story*.....(page 4)

Darkest Hour of the Labor Bosses: The question in Washington today is not whether the Democrats are in hot water, but "how hot is the water?"

Boiling — say most of those who have tested the intolerable bath in which the majority party in Congress threshes about, as GOP leader Knowland continues to demand real labor reform legislation, and Republicans Curtis, Goldwater and Mundt echo and re-echo his cry.

Capital opinion is that Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson committed an error, perhaps a mortal error, in cracking the parliamentary whip to defeat Knowland's series of "tough" amendments to the Democratic "slap-on-the-wrist" bill. Even the "liberal" Washington *Post* commented that now — after defeat of the Knowland amendments — the Democrats will have to get busy and produce a real labor reform measure this session or else.

In the lobbies, the "else" carries this meaning — a GOP resurgence at the polls next fall. Already, Republicans are recovering from recent dismal predictions (which contained much truth) about big losses in both houses of Congress come next November. GOP stock today is climbing.

The following sharp images emerge from the parliamentary huggermugger and din:

(1) Never before had the labor lobby assumed such an insolent attitude. Actually utilizing the Capitol offices of high Democratic officialdom as a center of operations, the union lobbyists poured into the environs of the floor and buttonholed the Senators. They even monopolized an elevator (marked "not for public use") to lighten their exertions. They worked with devastating effect on several Modern Republicans.

> ***(Conversation at the door leading to the legislative chamber.* Labor lobbyist to conservative GOP Senator: "What are you trying to do — put us out of business?" Senator: "Put unions out of business — no; but put you out of business — yes.")**

(2) Under Johnson's leadership, the Democrats (except for the independent Lausche of Ohio) voted solidly against the Knowland amendments, which would have enabled the rank-and-file members to check the excesses of the bosses. It is reported that Johnson is very worried at the way things have turned out.

(3) Among Southern conservative legislators mutterings arose: "Lyndon is wrecking the old coalition [of Republican and Democratic conservatives]." One member told HUMAN EVENTS confidentially: "Knowland is right; Lyndon should have joined him."

Actually, it is believed that Southern conservatives would have rebelled against the Johnson whip, if it had not been for Senator McClellan's reported assurances to his colleagues that real labor laws would be passed. The Arkansas Senator's own "milquetoast" labor bill, however, leaves many of his friends cold.

(4) The shadow of the late Senator Taft falls athwart the Senate floor — with thought-provoking effects. No member is unmindful of the fact that the Ohioan defied the labor oligarchy in his Senatorial re-election campaign of 1950 and won the biggest majority in his career, after appealing to rank-and-file union members over the heads of their bosses. Today, Knowland's sharply etched attempt to free the rank-and-file is expected to have similar consequences.

Finally, out of the melee of oratory pro and con on many problems before Congress, one issue emerges predominant. Former Senator Owen Brewster (R.-Me.) told HUMAN EVENTS: *"The Reuther recession is the issue. In short, Reuther — heading up the whole labor boss aggregation — stands as the main issue today. Reuther and the wage-price spiral, culminating in the automobile industry's present plight and its effects on the economy — that's the real focus of the national problem today. Real labor reform, to control this dangerous power, is a must in this session."*

Ike Resignation? President Eisenhower at his press conference last week emphasized that he had no intention of resigning and letting Nixon take over, so long as he feels capable of filling his job. Ike indicated that his frequent layoffs for vacations to Georgia, *etc.*, had no effect on the performance of his duties.

This emphatic statement was not accidental or casual. Nor was the rash of columnists' cries making the same points, which immediately preceded the press conference. Someone close to the President had gone to work.

All such utterances, observers believe, were aimed particularly at Republicans. Sharp-eared Democrats on Capitol Hill say that Republican congressional leaders want Ike to resign and believe that, if Nixon took over the Presidency, the Republicans would have a better chance of winning the House elections next fall and of holding their own in the Senate.

Among Republican leaders this view is privately stated, often and emphatically. It is felt that a Nixon "honeymoon" (the "Truman honeymoon" of 1945 is recalled) would alter the situation substantially come next November. In the GOP Senate cloakroom, some believe that this situation explains the extraordinary statement by GOP Chairman Alcorn, April 22. Alcorn, emerging from the White House,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

predicted that it was not "in the cards" for his party to win control of the Senate next fall — strong words for a party chairman to utter publicly.

The explanation among GOP Senators is that Alcorn went into the White House and told Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, that the only hope for GOP victory next fall would be the resignation of Eisenhower and assumption of power by Nixon. Alcorn got a cold reception from Adams, and resorted to shock treatment — his "not in the cards" statement — to stir up party ranks throughout the country. That's the way it looks to many up here on Capitol Hill. And that — they say — is why the President and friends have gone all out to suffocate talk of his resignation.

California Story: Senator Knowland's chances for winning the Governorship in California have risen sharply since his labor battle in Congress. For several months his Democratic opponent, Attorney General Pat Brown, has been rated as in the ascendant. But that candidate, though personable, has not given much evidence of leadership; and many Californians have started calling him "Pitty-Pat Brown."

Despite energetic efforts by the labor crowd, petitions for a referendum for a California right-to-work law have been making satisfactory forward progress; even labor circles privately admit the measure will get on the ballot.

Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco, running for the GOP Senatorial nomination against Governor Goodwin Knight, appears to be making strides; Christopher takes a stand on labor policy somewhere between Knowland's position and the openly pro-labor boss position of Knight.

Recently, Christopher warned California Republicans that Knight, if nominated, would desert Knowland and the GOP ticket. The Mayor mentioned Knight's resentment because Knowland had displaced him in the Governorship race.

● Suggesting the climate of California politics today is the candidacy of John J. Synon, for the GOP congressional nomination in the First District. Synon's campaign is virtually a one-plank affair: the right-to-work law. His literature states: "I believe in individual freedom, in the rights of the minority. I do not believe any private organization, whether it be a union, a political party, not even a church, has a right to force a person into membership. The Republican party was born to free men. Its charge, today, is no less great to see that men remain free."

Capital Gains: Economic analysts in Washington are speculating on a point raised by the remarks of G. Keith Funston, President of the New York Stock Exchange: namely, would a reduction in the rate of the capital-gains tax, by freeing "locked-in" capital, actually produce more, rather than less, revenue? (See Funston's article in HUMAN EVENTS for April 21, 1958: "The Case Against the Capital Gains Tax.")

Representative Richard Simpson (R.-Pa.), in presenting his tax reduction bill recently, stated that "people informed in making revenue estimates have advised me that the reduction in the capital-gains tax would not result in any revenue loss because of the expanded volume of capital transactions that would accompany the rate exchange."

Those studying Simpson's proposal and the remarks of such advocates of reduction as Funston recall the testimony presented by fiscal expert Elisha M. Friedman, when he rebutted Treasury Department opposition to reducing the capital-gains levy. In a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee some years ago, Friedman cited instances in which a drop in the rate had resulted in an increase in revenue-producing capital-gains activity. The rate, for example, was sharply decreased in 1938. Net capital gains rose from $661 million in 1937 to $817 million in 1938. Furthermore, Friedman observed, "1937 marked the end of a long bull market which started in 1933 . . . 1938 marked the bottom of the sensational bear market. Yet the lower rates produced more capital gains in the poor year 1938."

Treasury estimates established that the average annual yield from the capital-gains tax from 1931-40 had been only $16 million. Friedman estimated that, by reducing the capital-gains rate to ten per cent, the Government could realize an average annual yield of $200-600 million.

Business Political Action: One bulls-eye was scored in the just-concluded meeting of the US Chamber of Commerce in Washington. Cutting through the flood of plaintive business speeches, Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) told the Chamber how to remedy the ills which inspired their lamentations. The cure, Goldwater made clear, is political action by businessmen, whom he blistered for their timidity in not taking this course.

(This was no political hack whining for funds. Goldwater himself is a wealthy and successful businessman, head of a multimillion-dollar department store in his state.)

"I have seen the weakness and even cowardice in businessmen across the country," said Goldwater, "I have seen them wander off and leave us without support." He went on to plead that businessmen take active interest in political battles "instead of just staying home and griping." "It's time," he exclaimed, "for all to stiffen their knees and backs and to recognize that if you just sit back, the job will be done by those dedicated to the socialization of the United States."

Finally: "If you sit on your hands in 1960," Goldwater warned, "the President of the United States will be picked not by delegates in a convention but by labor leaders."

The warning implied by Goldwater's appeal for action was well expressed in the conclusion of the best-selling HUMAN EVENTS piece, "Men to Match My Mountains: A Blueprint for Business Political Action," by James M. Brewbaker (April 7, 1958): "What businessmen are getting today is a 'pink tea' compared to what will happen if all the elements allied with labor and supported by its political power really take over — and they will, if your business organizations fail you now."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Supreme Court: Conservatives hail the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee last week, as it favorably reported (by a 10 to 5 vote), the Jenner-Butler bill to undo the damage wrought by a long series of Supreme Court decisions bearing on internal security. The Committee had first approved two subsections of the bill, designed to cancel out the Court's action in the *Nelson* and *Yates* cases. These portions of the Jenner-Butler proposal would allow states to prosecute for subversive activity except where expressly forbidden by Congress, and redefine the term "organize," as it appears in the anti-Communist Smith Act, to mean recruiting members, *etc.*, for the Communist party, rather than merely the act of founding it. (For the story of earlier action by the Committee, see HUMAN EVENTS for April 28, 1958.)

● Supporters of the Jenner-Butler proposal also welcomed a recent pronouncement from one of America's foremost authorities on constitutional law, Professor Edward S. Corwin. In a pugnacious letter to *The New York Times* recently, Professor Corwin dissected "liberal" apologetics on behalf of the Supreme Court's Red Monday decisions of June 17, 1957. Corwin said that he agreed with the judgment that the Court's *Yates* decision — permitting "theoretical" propagandizing for violent revolution — left the Smith Act "a shambles." The Court's ruling in the *Watkins* case (requiring Congressional committees to define the precise relevance of any and every question to its legislative purpose) he characterized as "equally indefensible" and "sorry nonsense." "That Congress should consent that this great primal power [of investigation] . . . be kept in judicial leading strings," he said, "is out of the question."

Professor Corwin noted that the *Yates* decision, combined with the 1956 *Nelson* ruling, "seems to leave the country exposed to unlimited propaganda urging the right to overthrow government in the United States by force or violence. Even S. 2646 [the original Jenner bill] would be preferable to that."

Corwin added that the Court's theorizing in the *Yates* ruling was "nonsensical, and represents, I suspect, a recent tenderizing of the judicial mind toward the American Communist party."

He also observed that the self-incrimination clause of the Fifth Amendment was "a provision which Justice Cardozo thought could be repealed without attaint to fundamental rights, and ought to be."

Segregation: Further evidence of the South's determined stand against Federal encroachments in the school segregation controversy came recently from Virginia's Tenth Congressional District (the most "liberal" district in the state, since it is the suburban home of thousands of Washington bureaucrats). There, segregationists have formed a "Fundamental Education Organization," aimed at furnishing private schooling as a final defense against forced integration. (An integration appeal involving schools in the Tenth District is now pending before the Supreme Court, with a "showdown" expected next September.)

A similar organization has been formed in Virginia's Prince Edward county, site of one of the original segregation Court cases.

Keen students of the segregation conflict in Virginia advise HUMAN EVENTS *that resort to the closing of public schools is not far off in certain parts of the Old Dominion State, and that early creation of private school systems is in the cards. Under the state's "massive resistance" laws, a public school automatically closes when integrated.*

Education Front: Analysts of the Communist campaign to destroy Western society note that while Communist fronters, fellow travellers and kindred left-wingers have joined in the movement to promote "progressive" education for American students, the Communists tolerate no hint of "progressive" laxness in the education of their own children. A close-up view of Soviet educational techniques — revealing how far the Reds have rebounded from their unsuccessful "progressive" experiment of the 1920's — is provided by the school to which Soviet diplomatic officials send their children here in the Capital.

An article by Eleanor S. Lowman in the April 26, 1958 issue of *The Saturday Evening Post* discloses the strict regimen to which Soviet children are subjected. Soviet children attend class for four to five hours daily, six days a week; holidays are few; in the fifth grade, about 40 per cent of the students take up the study of English; in the sixth grade, algebra and geometry are introduced; homework in the high school grades ranges up to four hours nightly; grading is based upon objective performance; those failing one course must repeat a grade; discipline is strict.

Miss Lowman comments: "80 per cent of the class time of a Soviet student at the primary level is spent mastering language skills, learning arithmetic and studying science, history and geography. And because of the longer school week, fewer holidays and shorter summer vacations, Soviet children spend as many hours in class in ten years as do American children in twelve."

● America's "progressive" educationists attained new heights of achievement, by their own standards, at Central Michigan College this semester. There, students can now receive three semester credits for learning to fish, including instruction in when to use what type of bait, how to cast, and how to tie flies and make their own lures. The instructor's explanation: "who ever heard of a college graduate not knowing how to fish?"

**HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates go up June 1.
EXTEND your subscription at present LOW BARGAIN RATES.
Mail the coupon on page 4 NOW.**

McCarthy: The anniversary of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's death (May 2) has brought tributes to the Senator's memory from many parts of the country — most of them emphasizing his contributions to the struggle against the Communist world conspiracy. But, in the Nation's Capital, comment turns upon McCarthy's special achievements under the shadow of the dome.

Thus, former Democratic Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana, who lives in Washington and is a keen observer of what goes on in Government, took this opportunity to tell HUMAN EVENTS what he believes was McCarthy's particularly valuable accomplishment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I have in mind especially," said Wheeler, "his struggle to vindicate the right and duty of congressional committees to bring out really vital information to the American people. The year that has passed since McCarthy's death has seen, in a number of conflicts between the Legislature and Executive, repeated confirmation of McCarthy's thesis that Congress, through its investigating committees, is the eyes and ears of the people, and that it must be constantly vigilant to protect itself, and the public, from the tendency of the Executive to absorb Governmental and social powers to itself."

A veteran battler himself in committee rooms, Wheeler went on: "At the height of the controversy that attended his career, McCarthy stood virtually alone in this fight.

"Now, in such proposals as the Moss bill to guard against Executive secrecy and the recent actions of the Senate Judiciary Committee to strengthen congressional investigating powers, I think I see signs of a long-overdue awakening to the evils McCarthy sought to remedy.

"It was this very duty of congressional committees — to monitor the activities of the Executive branch and to keep it within its proper sphere — that my Montana colleague, Senator Tom Walsh, and I upheld in our investigation of the Teapot Dome scandals, and the Department of Justice under Daugherty, in 1924-5. That is what the 'division of powers' in the Federal Government really implies, and for doing his utmost to keep that constitutional principle alive, we are all deeply indebted to McCarthy."

Hoover: Completely unnoticed in reviews of Herbert Hoover's latest book, *The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson* (McGraw-Hill; $6), was the former Republican President's eulogy of the former Democratic President's basic conservatism. In the preface, page *vii*, Hoover writes of Wilson: "As a Jeffersonian Democrat, he was a 'liberal' of the nineteenth century cast. His training in history and economics rejected every scintilla of socialism, which today connotes a liberal.

"His philosophy of American living was based upon free enterprise, both in social and in economic systems. He held that the economic system must be regulated to prevent monopoly and unfair practices. He believed that Federal intervention in the economic or social life of our people was justified only when the task was greater than the states or individuals could perform for themselves.

"He yielded with great reluctance to the partial and temporary abandonment of our principles of life during the war, because of the multitude of tasks with which the citizen of the states could not cope. But he often expressed to me the hope that our methods of doing so were such that they could be quickly reversed and free enterprise restored."

Foundations: Subject of considerable favorable comment in the Capital is René Wormser's new book, *Foundations* (Devin-Adair: $7.50). Wormser, who served as chief counsel to the Committee of the House, headed by Representative Carroll Reece (R.-Tenn.), that dug into the question of tax-exempt foundations in 1954, here gives the complete story of these immensely powerful and secretive organizations, which have put the proceeds of capitalism at work to promote collectivist ends.

He traces the story forward from the Walsh commission investigation of 1915 — which saw potential menace in these favored aggregations of wealth — to the Reece committee's endeavors. With copious documentation, Wormser shows how the foundations' power has been diverted to the consistent promotion of internationalism, "progressive" education, welfarism and anti-anti-communism.

Knowledgeable Washingtonians hail the book as the most comprehensive and authoritative work on all key phases of this important subject. And they raise this question: why has this vital book been so consistently ignored by the big book review media?

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101 Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

ELDON MARTIN, Vice President and General Counsel, Burlington Railroad Lines: "HUMAN EVENTS is my favorite publication — the only one which I seem to find time to read religiously, that is, every word of each issue."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. *In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by* fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

- **Yearly rate,** $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
- **By first class mail,** $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
- **Bound Annual Volume for 1957,** with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
- **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**
- **The Declaration of Independence opens:** "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher* M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly newsletter *reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in* 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1958.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE INCREASE

HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates go up June 1. You may EXTEND your subscription at present LOW rates — if you act NOW. Fill out this coupon:

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please EXTEND my subscription for the period marked.

CHECK SERVICE DESIRED	Rate June 1	Renew NOW at	
☐ 1 year subscription	$11	$10	Saving you $1
☐ 2 year subscription	22	17	Saving you $5
☐ 3 year subscription	33	23	Saving you $10
☐ 4 year subscription	44	29	Saving you $15
☐ 5 year subscription	55	34	Saving you $21

☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me ☐ Bill my company

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone..... State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 18 HUMAN EVENTS May 5, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

TOWARD FREE ENTERPRISE IN EDUCATION

The Tax-Credit Plan

By FRANK CHODOROV

IT HAS been said that Congress will sometimes do the right thing but never for the right reason. A demonstration of this characteristic is now in the making. For, kicking around the House Ways and Means Committee right now are a number of bills which, while designed to aid education, inadvertently make concession to a principle: namely, that education is not a function of the Federal Government, that the less the Government messes around with education the better educated we will be.

To be sure, the principle is not stated in any of this legislation, but it is implied in the proposal (contained in over 20 bills) that the payer of college tuition, parent or friend, be allowed an income-tax credit for it. The allowance is usually limited to 30 per cent of the taxes due, with a top of $450.

The bill deemed to have the best chance for favorable action is HR 10904, sponsored by Representative Thomas B. Curtis (R.-Mo.). If this or any of the other bills should be enacted into law — at this time there is strong sentiment for the idea in the Committee — the only string attached to the credit allowance would be that the college selected by the student be an accredited institution of higher learning, which covers nearly every college that an honest-to-goodness student would want to attend. Beyond that, no bureaucratic direction or intervention is involved.

As far as the proposal goes, it is a concession to free enterprise in education. For that reason it does not have the blessing of the Administration. The Administration, speaking through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, favors a handout of $1 billion for "aid to education" — the principal feature of which is the granting of 10,000 scholarships annually for four years. Obviously, the distribution of these scholarships would be subject to bureaucratic discretion, and it can be taken for granted that the four-year limit is the "emergency" device by which the bureaucracy contrives to entrench itself permanently.

(Incidentally, in addition to the Administration bill, Congress has another, known as the Hill-Elliot bill, calling for the granting of 40,000 scholarships annually for six years, plus 20,000 during the first year for students now in college.)

IF THE Administration's bill should succeed, the drive toward Federal control of education will have been advanced considerably. On the well-known rule that he who pays the fiddler calls the tune, it can be predicted that the bureaucracy will set up and enforce regulations governing the granting of the scholarships. At this time, HEW is saying that the grantee will not be interfered with in the selection of a college or courses of study. But, when the President made his proposal for scholarship grants, shortly after Sputnik went into orbit, there was a great ado about our lack of scientists amounting to an "emergency."

Since then we have launched a couple of satellites of our own, thus creating "parity" with the Soviets, and the talk has veered from a program to flood the country with scientists in a hurry to one that will aid education in general. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that the Government will keep its hands off the education of students whom it has subsidized,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it will not launch investigations periodically to ascertain whether the grants are used for purposes conducive to the "general welfare."

* * *

When a young man is dead set on marrying the girl of his choice he develops a remarkable ingenuity for turning into virtues any of her inadequacies that may be pointed out to him. So it is with those who are bent on the nationalization of our educational plant. Last year, and for some years before that, these energumens called into being a dire need for classroom space, as demonstrated by a mass of figures pulled out of their collective hat. The fact that their figures were shown to be fictitious did not daunt them; they pressed for a monstrous outlay by the Federal treasury for the erection of school buildings, and might have succeeded but for the inclusion of an anti-segregation clause in the appropriation bill.

This year we hear nothing about the lack of classroom space. Thanks to the Sputnik furor, the nationalizers have been able to saddle up a new "crisis" and are riding it for all it is worth. Their cry now is that many of our brightest boys and girls are deprived of the opportunity of developing their talents for lack of means. Unless this handicap is removed, they say, by the spending of millions from the Federal till on scholarships, the Nation will be deprived of all this potential genius. (By the by, those who want to spend us into an education are currently being aided by those who would spend us into prosperity; that's the latest argument for scholarship grants.)

But, as in the case of the "facts" adduced to support the demand for classroom space, the "facts" about the need for scholarship grants do not hold up under scrutiny. Is it true that many of our brilliant high school graduates are passing up college for lack of funds?

The Lovejoy-Jones *College Scholarship Guide* — a reference book for students needing financial help — says in its introduction: "College scholarships are no longer elusive, hard-to-get plums. They are available for nearly everybody in higher education." If that is so, where will the bureaucrats pick up an additional 10,000 beneficiaries of their largess every year? Is it possible that they will have to scrape the bottom of the barrel — picking those who ought never to go to college? Or will the grants be made for other purposes than education — like buying votes?

THE GUIDEBOOK points out that many scholarships offered by colleges, individuals and corporations go begging, sometimes because of impossible conditions attached to them, but mostly because of lack of qualified applicants. Practically all of the scholarships offered must be won in competitive examinations or upon presentation of specified proof of competence. This is as it should be, for there is no sense in pushing through college those who have little aptitude for learning or who are lacking in industry. If the Administration's bill is put through, will the Government make its selections on the basis of competitive examinations? And, if so, will it not fix its standards so that at least 10,000 pass? What will it do with the money if it does not have enough candidates of proven ability? And — moreover — if Nevada qualifies 100 grantees and New York has only a dozen, what will the Senator from the Empire State say?

Scholarship expert S. Norman Feingold estimates that 10,000 scholarship grants go unawarded each year. That the number must be considerable can be inferred from the fact that some states go to the trouble of publishing booklets listing the number of scholarships available, and some colleges find it likewise necessary to broadcast such information. It is a certainty that if applicants were in abundance, more than the colleges can take care of, there would be no need of issuing such printed matter. The US Office of Education lists in its latest catalogue of financial aid a total of $65.7 million in annual "fellowships" for undergraduates (1955-56 school year).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aside from outright grants offered deserving and needy students, ranging from a couple of hundred dollars a year to full tuition plus room and board, many colleges offer ambitious students help in the form of loans, to be repaid in easy installments over a long period. A grand total of $202.3 million is available in all forms of scholarship aid for undergraduates and graduates. The guidebook reports that a number of colleges do not have borrowers enough to exhaust their funds. If, as the Administration's bill implies, there are 10,000 education-hungry high school graduates who must remain starved because of lack of funds, why don't they apply for loans?

Then, there is the time-honored American custom of working one's way through college. While at this moment the number of part-time or summer jobs for students may be down, it is a matter of common knowledge among university men that during recent years the employment offices have had more job opportunities than applicants. Maybe some of the 10,000 whom the Administration is anxious to subsidize — assuming they really want an education—ought to exhaust the possibility of making their own way, rather than becoming wards of the state. It is a difficult discipline, but much can be said for it on the score of character-building. After all, some of our most brilliant and successful citizens managed to get through college that way.

* * *

There is absolutely no support for the estimate made by Secretary Folsom of HEW that "about 200,000 of our ablest students now stop their education below the college level" because, as he implied, they lack the means. It seems to be a figure taken out of an "emergency" to support a "crisis."

The best way to determine how many more of our high school graduates would avail themselves of a college education is to institute the tax-credit plan. The credit contemplated — a maximum of $450 — would hardly cover the cost of a college education, but it would be an incentive; the balance could be made up by the family, or by earnings from part-time jobs, or by loans, or by winning in competitive examinations some prize or scholarship offered by the college. The "ablest students" about whom Secretary Folsom speaks would prove themselves so by making an effort to get their education.

It is entirely possible that 200,000 tax credits would be made available to students. The credit could be taken by any taxpayer who helps a student through college, and that includes corporations and individuals other than parents. The credit would be a deduction from the amount of taxes due — from the last line on the tax form; the donor of the scholarship would not be out of pocket for one cent of the education, for if he did not take the credit he would have to pay that amount in taxes.

A corporation owing the Government $1 million in taxes could deduct 30 per cent — 300 thousand — for nearly 700 scholarships. Obviously, it would hunt around for candidates. Advocates of Federal grants argue that the credits would favor those in the higher brackets, would be of no help to parents of students who pay little or no income taxes. But, why should not the corporation take advantage of the credit allowance, which costs them nothing, to promote good will among its employees? Or, for "public relations" reasons? And every wealthy alumnus would be most anxious to take full advantage of this costless credit allowance to help students (or football players) through his alma mater.

As against this profusion of scholarships that the tax credit would make available, the Administration's proposal of 10,000 annual grants will actually decrease the number of scholarships now available. *The Wall Street Journal* reports that some corporations are holding up their scholarship dispensing plans until

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is clear what the Government will do. "We're going to mark time," one executive is quoted, "until we see what Federal programs will emerge in this field." Another said: "If the Government adds 10,000 scholarships or so, that could change the entire nature of our program." He then went on to explain that the colleges would need more money to meet the additional overhead. Just as private contributions to eleemosynary institutions tend to fall off when the Government takes them under its wing, so Federal scholarship grants will discourage the setting up of private scholarships. What would be the point of establishing a scholarship fund, by an alumnus or a class, in the face of a Government subsidy?

Opponents of the credit-allowance plan maintain that it would cost the Government a lot of tax money — which is an indirect admission that corporations and individuals would take liberal advantage of the credits to help students through college. Just how much money would thus be diverted from the Federal Government is hardly determinable. But, the President mentioned $1 billion as the appropriation necessary to put his aid program into effect; so that, whatever the credit plan should cost, the amount would be offset by a saving of that billion.

Perhaps the real fiscal argument against the credit plan is that all the money lost by the Government would go to helping students get an education, while nothing would go to administrative bureaucrats.

The interesting inference one can make from the number of tax-credit bills under discussion is that an anti-centralizing point of view is finally seeping into the legislative mind. They seem to spell out the idea that the citizen should be allowed to spend more of his money in his own way, without let or hindrance. There is one bill, for instance, that would allow self-employed citizens a portion of their taxes for a retirement fund; this could be described as voluntary "self security," as opposed to compulsory "social security." Another would allow teachers to make deductions for the the cost of improving themselves professionally, as by taking summer courses. Do such proposals indicate a trend of thought? One hopes so.

ONE OF the most far-reaching of the tax-credit bills is HR 9599. It defines higher education as beginning in the ninth grade, or the first high school year. If this measure were to be enacted into law, which seems at this writing improbable, the 30 per cent credit allowance would apply to tuition paid to private secondary schools. This would be a tremendous boon to the private school business, both lay and church-connected, for it is quite possible to put a student through one of these schools at $450 a year, provided, of course, it is spent on education — not on country club facilities. If the minds in Washington were attuned to free enterprise in education, this bill would get sincere consideration, for it would go a long way toward setting up competition between private and public high schools and thus improve the quality of education in those grades.

As mentioned previously, the tax-credit bill that seems to have the best chance in the Ways and Means Committee is HR 10904, sponsored by Representative Curtis. Rumor has it that Vice President Nixon has endorsed the principle embodied in this legislation. Its chances would be improved if the electorate were to support it with a mail campaign to Congressmen.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. *and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes.* It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "TOWARD FREE ENTERPRISE IN EDUCATION," at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED